

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action of June 2, 2003 and the references cited therein have been carefully studied and reviewed, and in view of the foregoing Amendment and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the allowance of claim 11 by the Examiner is hereby kindly acknowledged.

Next, claims 1 – 10 have been canceled. New claims 12 – 17 have been added so as to more clearly patentably distinguish the present invention over Lorimer (USP 5,334,237).

More specifically, new claim 12 calls for a gas supply apparatus for supplying gas to a process chamber 90, and a vented residual gas removing system. The gas supply apparatus includes a mass flow controller (WF6 of 60, for example), and a gas inlet line 81 connecting the outlet of the (WF6) mass flow controller to a low stress valve 100. The vented residual gas removing system is in gas flow communication with the gas inlet line 81 of the gas supply apparatus so as to remove residual gas therefrom.

Lorimer does disclose a gas supply apparatus including a gas inlet line 82, and a valve for feeding a process gas to a chamber (indicated by reference numeral 72. Lorimer also discloses a mass flow controller 64. However, the mass flow controller 64 is not part of the gas supply apparatus for supplying gas to the chamber 72. In particular, and as distinguished from Applicants' claim 12, the gas inlet line 82 of Lorimer does not connect the outlet of the mass flow controller 64 to valve 56. Moreover, there is no suggestion in Lorimer to modify the model purification system of Lorimer so as to have the gas line 94 connect the outlet of the mass flow controller 64 to the valve 56.

Accordingly, Lorimer does not render the subject matter of new claim 12 obvious under 35 USC 103.

New claims 13 and 14 contain substantial limitations found in original claims 3 and 5. New claims 13 and 14 are seen to be allowable for the same reasons that the Examiner considered original claims 3 and 5 to contain allowable subject matter.

Finally, new method claim 17 sets forth the method of the present invention as specifically applied to the forming of a tungsten silicide film in a manner that prevents the layer from which the film is formed from being tungsten rich. No such method is disclosed by Lorimer.


Therefore, the Lorimer reference does not render Applicants' new method claim 17 obvious under 35 USC 103.

For these reasons, namely because of the above-described differences between Applicants' invention of new claims 12 and 17 and the prior art, including the lack of suggestion in Lorimer of a residual gas removing system and of removing residual WF6 gas in a method of forming a tungsten silicide film, it is seen that the Lorimer reference does not render Applicants' claims obvious under 35 USC 103. Accordingly, early reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, PLLC

By:


Michael Stone
Reg. No. 32,442

Reg. No. 332,337 Filed

August 28, 2003

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, PLLC
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 715-0870